ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

The claims have been amended by rewriting Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 17 and 24, canceling Claim 8, and adding new Claims 25-28. New Claims 25-28 find support in the specification at page 11, lines 24-26 and page 12, lines 23-24. Claims 1-7 and 9-28 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks and arguments.

Corrections to the drawings, included in a "Replacement Sheet," are enclosed for approval by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the submission of corrected formal drawings be delayed until such time as the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejects Claim 9 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "the at least one CPU instruction set" and rejects Claim 10 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "the CPU instruction set." Applicants have deleted Claim 8 and amended Claim 7 to add the limitation from Claim 8 of "and the CPU has at least one instruction set." Amended Claim 7, thus, provides antecedent basis for the above limitations cited by the Examiner, thereby, rendering moot the Examiner's §112 rejections of Claims 9 and 10.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Applicants traverse these rejections. To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each element of the claim. M.P.E.P. 2131. Applicants submit that the AAPA of this application does not anticipate amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 as it fails to teach each limitation recited in these claims and included by dependency in Claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-23. Specifically, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 to add the limitation that the PCU comprises "at least one program address register." Applicants submit that the AAPA, i.e., Fig. 1, of this application fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Figs. 3-5, each illustrating an embodiment of the PCU of the present invention, show the PCU as including at least one program address register. The specification at page 9, lines 10-13 and page 11, lines 21-29 further supports these amendments to Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24. Conversely,

the general peripheral device 300 in Fig. 1 that the Examiner identifies as a PCU, is not the PCU claimed in amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 because device 300 clearly fails to comprise at least one program control register as recited in these claims.

Thus, for all of the reasons above, Applicants submit that the AAPA of this application does not anticipate amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24. Therefore Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 are now in a condition for allowance, and Claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-23 and 25-28 that depend from and include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims are likewise in a condition for allowance for all of the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

The Applicants note the art cited, but not relied upon by the Examiner.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Law Department
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

Valerie M. Davis Attorney of Record Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: (847) 576-6733 Fax No.: (847) 576-0721